

### Remarks

Claims 1-2, 4-11, 15-16, and 18-27 are pending. By this Amendment, claims 1, 4-5, 11, 15-16, 18, and 21 have been amended, claims 3, 12-14, and 17 have been cancelled, and claims 25-27 have been added. No new matter is believed added. Reconsideration and allowance are requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 4, 6, and 8 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant gratefully acknowledges the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter. Accordingly, claim 4 has been rewritten in independent form as new independent claim 25.

Claims 1-3, 5, and 7-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Crouse et al. (US 5,925,990), hereafter "Crouse," in view of Goder et al. (US 5,978,195), hereafter "Goder." This rejection is defective because Crouse and Goder, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every feature of claims 1-3, 5, and 7-24 as required by 35 U.S.C. 103(a).


Regarding independent claim 1, Crouse fails to teach or suggest, among other features, the blocking of pulse trains to a lighting device wherein the pulse trains are blocked in response to an overload condition, and modified if said overload condition persists, "wherein said blocking is done for a defined time interval **while the pulse trains continue to be supplied**, and said modification is done if the overload condition persists

after a defined number of blocking cycles have been executed.” On the contrary, Crouse’s system is configured to discontinue (i.e., disable) the pulse output of inverter 54 in response to the detection of a fault condition (see, e.g., col. 4, lines 25-33). Goder operates in a similar manner to disable the output of a power supply 50 in response to a fault condition (see, e.g., col. 5, lines 2-9). Claims 11, 18, and 21 include similar features. Accordingly, since Crouse and Goder, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every feature of the claims, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-2, 4-11, 15-16, and 18-27 are allowable.

If the Examiner believes that anything further is necessary to place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicant’s undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 10/8/63

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Ronald A. D'Alessandro, Jr.  
Reg. No. 42,456

Hoffman, Warnick & D'Alessandro LLC  
Three E-Comm Square  
Albany, NY 12207  
(518) 449-0044 - Telephone  
(518) 449-0047 - Facsimile